



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,275	03/04/2002	Nacerdine Azzi	RCA 89433 (PF990009)	8474

7590 10/20/2006  
Joseph S Tripoli  
Thomson Multimedia Licensing  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

DONG, DALEI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/937,275		AZZI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dalei Dong		2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 8-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 14, 2006 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1, 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,121,028 to Milili in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,152,685 to Renders.

Regarding to claim 1, Milili discloses in Figures 2-6, a deflection unit (55) for a color cathode ray tube comprising: a pair of saddle shaped vertical deflection coils (10) extending along a longitudinal axis Z of the tube, the pair of coils comprising a front portion (19) proximal a display screen, a rear portion (9) proximal an electron gun, and a harness portion (11 and 12) extending laterally between the front (19) and rear portion (9)

and forming a window region (18) there-between, the harness portion (11 and 12) defined by an edge (11a and 12a) extending laterally at a constant first radial angular position of about 0 degrees from the rear portion to a first location within the window region (18).

However, Milili does not disclose the edge having a second radial angular position at a second location within the window region.

The Renders reference teaches in Figures 2C-E and 3C-E, a deflection unit for a color cathode-ray tube comprising: the edge having a second radial angular position at a second location within the window region (column 2, line 40 to column 3, line 15) for the purpose of improving the accuracy of the electron converging on the display screen and enhancing a horizontal deflection efficiency, and eliminating a color shift of a convergence at a peripheral portion and an intermediate portion of a tube surface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have construct the vertical deflection coil of Milili with a second radial angular position at a second location within the window region according to Renders in order to improve the accuracy of the electron converging on the display screen and enhances a horizontal deflection efficiency, and eliminates a color shift of a convergence at a peripheral portion and an intermediate portion of a tube surface.

Regarding to claim 3, Milili in view of Renders discloses the claimed invention except for the 7th-order harmonic of the potential is positive at the front of the coils, the Examiner asserts that the 7th-order harmonic is merely a property of the cathode ray tube and the prior art of record discloses the claimed invention. Further, it has been held that

the property of a claimed apparatus does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations (see MPEP 2114).

Regarding to claim 10, Render teaches in Figures 2C-E and 3C-E, the second radial angular position is at least about 5 degrees and the motivation to combine is the same as above.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 8 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding to claim 8, prior art of record taken alone or in combination fails to teach or suggest a deflection unit for a colour cathode-ray tube comprising: the constant second radial angular position is not more than about 30 degrees.

Regarding to claim 9, prior art of record taken alone or in combination fails to teach or suggest a deflection unit for a colour cathode-ray tube comprising: the first radial angular position is about 0 degrees. The Render reference teaches the second radial angular position is not more than about 25 degrees. Thus, the difference between the first radial angular position and the second radial angular position is not more than about 25 degrees and the motivation to combine is the same as above.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed August 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the Milili reference does not teach or suggest the harness portion defined by an edge extending laterally at a constant first radial angular position of about 0 degrees from the rear portions to the first location within the window region, the Examiner respectfully disagree. The Milili reference clearly shown in Figures 2-6, that the first radial angular position of about 0 degrees extending all the way to the front window, and thus the Examiner interprets that the first radial angular position can be defined from the rear portions to any first location within the window region, and thus the Milili reference teaches the claimed invention. The Examiner asserts that the combination of the Milili reference and the Render reference teaches the claimed invention and maintains the rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalei Dong whose telephone number is (571)272-2370. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 A.M. to 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar Patel can be reached on (571)272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D.D.  
October 3, 2006



Dalei Dong  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2879